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INTERP 2

**Strategy: If they read “aims only”, read this + reasons why policy is good too. If they read “policies only”, read this + reasons why aims is good too.**

# \*\*RIGHTS/INTERESTS T\*\*

## INTERP

**A) Interpretation: The resolution is a question of competing rights and interests. The aff needs to prove that the state’s interest in rehabilitation or an individual’s right to rehab ought to be prioritized over the state’s interest in or rights protected by retributive punishment when they conflict.**

1. **Topic Lit**
   1. **My interp is more representative of the topic lit because both rehabilitationists and retributivists argue both in the aims and policies views, depending on the reason they have adopted that view. For example, McVay and Holloway defend rehab because it protects the state’s interest in crime control, which is a discussion of policy, whereas Rotman and Cullen say rehab protects rights that defendants are entitled to, which guides the CJS. Likewise, Gray and Hudson believe retribution is a practical limit on sentencing, which requires a discussion of sentencing, whereas Zaibert and Lesnoff think retribution is a justification of punishment, which does not require policy discussion. Since authors discuss the topic within both the aims and policies view, their interp denies me half the ground on the topic. Topic lit most fairly divides ground by creating a universally accessible basis for pre-round prep, which also determines round education.**
   2. **My interp accommodates discussion of philosophy and policy, depending on the ethical framework that determines which is relevant, so there is no ground loss or change in interaction for them, but I include ALL of the topic lit. The ethical framework determines which types of arguments are relevant.**
2. **Depth of Clash:** 
   1. **My interp forces clash not only on differing aims and policies, but also on the interaction between two different areas of topic lit, which forces deeper comparison between advocacies that are unique to my interp. Clash controls the internal link to education because actual discussion is necessary for development of issues.**
   2. **That also means we control real world education because philosophy clashes in the context of policy.**

**Lichtman and Rohrer** [Lichtman, Allan J. and Daniel M. Rohrer. POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND]

As we observed in a 1979 article devoted to the very issues raised in this objection, **[T]he policy-systems model** actually **“paves the way for direct clashes over** the **ideology that** implicitly or explicitly **guides all human decision.** For **[T]he model highlights** the combination of fact and **value in policy comparison and clarifies the relationships between means and ends in policy systems.** Rowland lampoons value debate, noting the absurdity of arbitrarily assigning “justice a numerical importance 7.3 with freedom slightly higher at 8.4” Such “a quantitative measure of value,” he adds, “reflects only the rater’s intuitive evaluation of the importance of the value.”8 Never do we advocate inflexible and arbitrary assignments of weights to core values like freedom and justice. Instead **[W]e alert advocates to the importance of grasping the philosophical foundations** for guiding values and of establishing priorities **among policy outcomes according to the value tradeoffs they entail.**

**[Voter]**